

REMARKS

Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration of this application in view of the foregoing amendments and following remarks.

Status of the Claims

Applicant notes that claim 55 has been erroneously indicated to be cancelled in the “REMARKS” section of the previous amendment filed on September 28, 2005 while the “Listing of Claims” section correctly indicates that claim 55 remains pending. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully requests that claim 55 be restored to be pending.

Claims 1-55, 72-137, and 309-319 are pending in this application. Claims 1, 14, 27, 38, 47, 72, 85, 98, 109, 118, 127 and 309 are independent. All of the pending claims (i.e., claims 1-55, 72-137, and 309-319) stand rejected. By this Amendment, all of the pending independent claims 1, 14, 27, 38, 47, 72, 85, 98, 109, 118, 127 and 309 have been amended. No new matter has been added by this amendment.

Rejection under 35 U.S.C. §103

Claims 1-54, 72-137, and 309-319 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,938,051 to Burger et al. (“Burger”).

Referring to Burger, the Examiner indicates in the Final Office Action that “...these second level sub-categories are not *Cigars*..., but church denominations, and clearly they are linked to *Churches*, else they could not be accessed by clicking 333.” Applicant notes that a portion of Burger describes “... under the heading 331 for ‘Churches,’ sub-headings for churches of various denominations can be displayed by clicking on the plus sign 333.” Col. 8, lines 32-35 of Burger.

Applicant respectfully traverses the Examiner's rejection. The instant invention as featured in the pending claims is different from the electronic Yellow Pages viewer as described in Burger which shows the pages of a Yellow Pages directory as they appear in the bound version (i.e., hard copy) of the directory, as well as the limited example under the heading 331 for "Churches" and clicking on the plus sign 333 to display subheadings for churches of various denominations. Independent claims 1, 14, 27, 38, 47, 72, 85, 98, 109, 118, 127 and 309 have been amended for further clarification.

Amended claim 1 is directed to a method of guiding a user through at least three interface levels of an internet virtual directory system to a desired internet website. In particular, the method of claim 1 recites, *inter alia*, the categories in each of the first, second and third levels are pre-selected and uploaded by a service provider of the internet virtual directory system, and the categories of at least the second level are pre-selected based on the user's expected search results relating to the selected first level search category and uploaded by the service provider. Other independent claims (i.e., claims 14, 27, 38, 47, 72, 85, 98, 109, 118, 127 and 309) are amended in similar manner.

One of the aspects of the present invention as featured in the amended claims is to efficiently guide the user undertaking an internet search for a particular subject matter to a desired internet website without being burdened with excessive and irrelevant search results during the search. To achieve the goal, the present invention provides the user with at least three interface levels linked to each other and each of which lists categories which are pre-selected and uploaded by the service provider. In particular, the instant invention recites that "the categories of at least the second level are pre-selected based on the user's expected search results relating to

the selected first level search category and uploaded by the service provider.” For example, if a user clicked on the word “Barbecue” at the first interface as a first level search category, the system/method of the present invention presents a second interface containing “Accessories”, “Custom Built”, “BBQ Sauces”, “General Information”, “Manufacturers”, “Recipes”, “Restaurant Chains” and “Retailers” as second level search categories as shown in Fig. 6 of the specification. These second level search categories are pre-selected based on the user’s expected search results relating to the selected first level search category (i.e., Barbecue) and uploaded by the service provider. In this way, the user is provided with customized second level listings related to the selected first level search category. Continuing the example, the user then may click on, e.g., the “Manufacturers” of the second level search categories, to view a list of URLs of different manufacturers as shown, for example, in Fig. 7 of the specification. This feature of the invention guides the user by narrowing the user’s search on each level to quickly arrive at a target point (e.g., a manufacturer of barbecue) without encountering unnecessary and unrelated results.

Disclosing a method of electronically viewing a hard copy of the Yellow Pages in a computer environment, Burger simply fails to show or suggest the teachings of the present invention that guides a user to an internet website through the steps as discussed above. In particular, displaying “various denominations” of a subject in the Yellow Pages does not teach, suggest or disclose that the listings are pre-selected based on the user’s expected search results relating to the selected first level search category as specifically recited in the amended independent claims, nor does it teach, suggest or disclose guiding the user to a desired internet website.

Application No. 09/781,901
Amendment dated May 15, 2006
Reply to Final Office Action of February 17, 2006

Docket No. 4150-4000US1

Accordingly, each of amended independent claims 1, 14, 27, 38, 47, 72, 85, 98, 109, 118, 127 and 309 is believed to be neither anticipated nor rendered obvious in view of Burger for at least the reasons discussed above.

Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections of claims 1, 14, 27, 38, 47, 72, 85, 98, 109, 118, 127 and 309 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) is respectfully requested. Applicant has not individually addressed the rejections of the dependent claims because Applicant submits that the independent claims from which they respectively depend are in condition for allowance as set forth above. Applicant, however, respectfully reserves the right to address such rejections of the dependent claims if necessary. Applicant believes that the application as amended is in condition for allowance over the cited prior art reference and such action is respectfully requested.